

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's Action mailed on March 28, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicant has editorially amended claims 1, 2 and 10. Claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims, and claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC §112, ¶2 as indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The phrases "implementing one of the functions corresponding to the status value by the BIOS" and "implementing one of the functions corresponding to the status value by the operating system" have each been deleted from both claim 1 and claim 10.

A technical specification entitled "ACPI specified components", published on April 13, 2002, is submitted herewith. Exemplary ASL (ACPI Source Language) codes are shown in this technical specification. ASL codes are referred to in the specification, for example on page 4, lines 1-3: "In step **33**, in cooperation with the embedded controller **1261**, the CPU **100** loads the ASL code from the BIOS and implements the procedure thereof" and in original claim 20, and are one example of program codes. Thus, the meaning of "program codes" in claim 10 is clear and definite.

Claims 1-20 are therefore definite.

AMENDMENT

10/650,691

It is noted that no substantive rejections were made relating to claims 8, 9, 16 and 17, and as the formal rejections have been overcome, these claims contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Huang* (US 2004/0042166 A1) with *Baik et al.* (US 6,529,219 B1), and claims 10-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Huang* with *Baik et al.* and *Paolini* (US 6,429,793 B1). These rejections are each respectfully traversed.

Neither *Huang* nor *Baik et al.* nor *Paolini* teach the step of “reading a status value corresponding to the pressed hotkey from the BIOS, and transferring the read status value to a corresponding driving device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions if the operating system is of the first type” as recited in claim 1, and neither do these references teach or suggest a CPU “reading one of the status values corresponding to the hotkey event from the BIOS, and transferring the read status value to a corresponding driving device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions if the operating system is of the first type” as recited in claim 10.

Further, neither *Huang* nor *Baik et al.* nor *Paolini* teach the step of “reading the status value corresponding to the pressed hotkey from the BIOS, and transferring the read status value to the operating system to drive a corresponding device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions if the operating system is of the second type” as recited in claim 1, and nor do they teach or suggest a

CPU “reading one of the status values corresponding to the hotkey event from the BIOS, and transferring the read status value to the operating system to drive a corresponding device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions if the operating system is of the second type” as recited in claim 10.

The Office Action admits that the *Huang* ‘166 application does not teach implementing a hotkey function in Windows 2000 or XP by “transferring the status value to the operating system by the BIOS, and implementing one of the functions corresponding to the status value by the operating system”, and alleges that this is taught by *Baik et al.*

However, selecting and executing an application program in a shell program by pressing a hot key, as taught by *Baik et al.*, is not equivalent to an operation of “transferring the read status value to a corresponding driving device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions”, or “transferring the read status value to the operating system to drive a corresponding device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions” as presently claimed in claim 1, or to “transferring the read status value to a corresponding driving device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions”, or “transferring the read status value to the operating system to drive a corresponding device implementing one of a plurality of hotkey functions” as presently claimed in claim 10 (*emphasis added*).

In the present invention the *corresponding device* may be, in a non-limiting example, a bridge logic device that asserts a system interrupt. In any case, such a device is a physical part of the computer that implements a hot key function at a

low level, i.e. by hardware means. In contrast, the hot keys provided in *Baik et al.* are for access to high-level software applications, not low-level physical *devices*. Pressing a hot key in *Baik et al.* merely executes a high-level software application that has been registered in a shell program, which fails to teach or suggest the above claimed features.

*Paolini* is relied upon in the Office Action with respect to claim 10 and its dependent claims, as showing a ROM with a translation table, but also fails to teach or suggest the above claimed features.

For the reasons stated above, neither Huang nor *Baik et al.* nor *Paolini*, whether taken separately or in combination, teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 10 of the present application. Claims 1 and 10 are therefore allowable over the cited references. Insofar as all claims depend from claim 1 or claim 10, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

June 26, 2006

Date



Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838  
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995  
Facsimile: 202-408-0924; 202-408-5297  
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP